



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/681,796

10/08/2003

Stephen Brian Gates

81230.97US1

6632

34018

7590

08/15/2006

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
77 WEST WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 2500
CHICAGO, IL 60601-1732

EXAMINER

DINH, DUC Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 9, 2006 has been entered.

Claims 1-4, 9-12, 14, 20, and 22-28 are cancelled, claims 29-39 are newly added. A Non-Final Office Action is provided as follows.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 30 objected to because of the following informalities: "the control device as recited in claim 1" in line 1 should read ""the control device as recited in claim 30" for being consistent with the new claim 30.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 9-13, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,137,479) hereinafter Olsen, in view of Lu (US 2003/0107552 A1).

In reference to claim 1 Olsen discloses a controlling device (Fig. 2A) for controlling a PC and one or more home appliances (col. 2, lines 40-68), the controlling device comprising:

a wireless transmitter for sending control data to the PC and one or more home appliances (col. 4, lines 6-9; col. 5, lines 1-7).

a plurality of user interface buttons (28 and 36)
programming (in computer 30; col. 4, lines 23-31) responsive to the signal generated by the sensor for selectively enabling either a first subset (28) of a plurality of user interface buttons (26 and 38) or a second subset of the plurality of user interface buttons (36) which is distinct from the first subset of user interface buttons (28) wherein a first subset (28) of the plurality of user interface buttons are activatable to cause the control data to be transmitted to the PC via the wireless transmitter and the second subset (36) of the plurality of the user interface buttons (28 and 36) are activatable to cause the control data to the one or more home appliances via wireless transmitter (the computer mouse can be programmed to perform other functions such as controlling auxiliary devices; col. 4, lines 64-67)

Accordingly, Olsen discloses everything except a sensor for generating signal indicative of a position of the control device relative to the surface

Lu discloses a computer mouse with dual functionality including a sensor for generating signal indicative of a position of control device (mouse 112) with a surface [0030-0031].

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a sensor a sensor for generating signal indicative of a position of control device (mouse 112) relative to a surface in the mouse of Olsen in view of the teaching of Lu because it

Art Unit: 2629

would provide a control device that can avoid inadvertent operations between computer and home appliances.

In reference to claim 2, Olsen discloses the wireless transmitter comprises a first wireless transmitter (col. 4, lines 5-10) and a second wireless transmitter (col. 5, lines 1-7), the first wireless being used in response to activation of any of the first subset (28) of the plurality of user interface buttons (28 and 36) [use for the mouse mode; col. 4, lines 5-10] and the second wireless transmitter being used in response to activation of any of the second subset (key of the keypad 36 of the user interface buttons (remote control mode; col. 5, lines 1-7).

In reference to claims 31 and 32, Olsen discloses the wireless transmitter can be infrared or radio frequency (col. 4, lines 5-10; col. 5, lines 1-5).

In reference to claim 33, Olsen discloses keys 34 of keypad 36 is hark keys (col. 5, lines 34-40).

In reference to claim 39, Olsen discloses wherein at least one of the plurality of user interface buttons is included within both the first subset of the plurality of user interface buttons and the second subset of the plurality of user interface buttons (col.5, lines 39-42)

Claims 22-27 are method and computer instructions claims corresponding to the apparatus of claims 1-4, 9-13, 20 and therefore, rejected based on the same basis set forth in said claims.

5. Claims 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen in view of Lu (US 2003/0107552 A1) as applied to claims 29-33 and 39 above and further in view of Lueders (U.S Patent No. 6,067,074).

In reference to claims 34 and 34, the combination of Olsen and Lu does not disclose the button based user interface comprises an EL panel and a graphical user interface having active elements for causing the control data signals to be transmitted to the system. Lueders discloses a button based user interface using an EL panel (34; Fig. 2) with graphical user interface having active elements provided on the panel (Fig. 4-5 and 8; col. 4, lines 32-43; col. 6, lines 41-51).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the EL panel with the graphical user interface provided thereon in the control unit of Olsen and Lu in view of the teaching of Lueders because it would provide users a friendly control panel for controlling including an array of pressure sensitive dots responding to a graphical input giving the users new options to select for accomplishing desired function (col. 2, lines 62-65).

In reference to claim 26, Olsen discloses the first subset (28) comprises a plurality of hard keys (mouse button 28; Fig. 2A).

In reference to claim 37, refer to the rejection as applied to claim 34 and 35 fro the keys represented on the display.

In reference to claim 38, Olsen discloses the display 34 remain dark (not active) when the computer mouse is in used (col. 4, lines 23-43).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to newly presented claims 29-39 have been considered but are persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, i.e. Lu does not concerned with controlling anything other than movement of the cursor and selection on the PC screen, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In the instant case, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a sensor for generating signal indicative of a position of control device (mouse 112) relative to a surface in the mouse of Olsen in view of the teaching of Lu because it would provide a control device that can avoid inadvertent operations between computer and home appliances as discussed above.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DUC Q. DINH whose telephone number is (571) 272-7686. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RICHARD HJERPE can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DUC Q DINH
Examiner
Art Unit 2629

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Duc Q Dinh', with a stylized, cursive script.

DQD
August 9, 2006